

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 6-10 and 16-19 have been withdrawn from consideration. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 and 11-15. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 1-5 and 11-15.

The Examiner states that the title is not descriptive. The Examiner states that a new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The Examiner further states that the current title is imprecise. Applicant has amended the title. Applicant submits that the Examiner requirement for a new title has been obviated.

The Examiner has required restriction. Applicant affirms election of Group I, claims 1-5 and 11-15.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Oki (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,595). Applicant respectfully disagrees. As an example, Applicant submits that Oki fails to disclose “an activity latch for holding an activity flag value” in accordance with the present invention as set forth in claim 1. As another example, Applicant submits that Oki fails to disclose “receiving a first activity flag value from a first activity latch of a first line card circuit of the plurality of line card circuits” in accordance with the present invention as set forth in claim 11. The Examiner cites AND circuit 81 of Oki as teaching an activity latch. However, the AND circuit 81 of Oki is merely a combinational logic element and, as such, is incapable of “holding an activity flag value” and cannot be considered to disclose an activity latch.

Regarding claim 1, as noted above, Applicant submits that the AND circuit 81 of Oki fails to anticipate “an activity latch for holding an activity flag value.” Thus, Applicant submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 2, as noted above, neither AND gate 81a nor AND gate 81b of Oki discloses “an activity latch.” Thus, not only does Oki fail to disclose “an activity latch,” but Oki also fails to disclose “a second activity latch of a second line card circuit.” Moreover, Applicant notes that none of the teachings of Oki, column 11, lines 56-61, cited by the Examiner appear to disclose the feature of claim 2 “wherein the activity flag value is mutually exclusive with a second activity flag value.” Thus, Applicant submits that claim 2 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 3, as noted above, Applicant submits that Oki fails to disclose the features of claim 1 from which claim 3 depends. Moreover, Applicant notes that Oki fails to disclose an “activity flag value” consonant with the claimed invention. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 3 is also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 4, as noted above, Applicant submits that Oki fails to disclose the features of claim 1 from which claim 4 depends. Moreover, Applicant notes that Oki fails to disclose an “activity flag value” consonant with the claimed invention. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 4 is also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 5, as noted above, Applicant submits that Oki fails to disclose the features of claim 1 from which claim 5 depends. Moreover, Applicant notes that Oki fails to disclose an “activity flag value” consonant with the claimed invention. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 5 is also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 11-15, as noted above, Applicant submits that Oki fails to disclose a “first activity latch” as set forth in claim 11. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 11 is in condition for allowance. As to claim 12, Applicant submits that Oki fails to disclose either a “first activity latch” or a “second activity latch.” Moreover, Applicant notes that none of the teachings of Oki, column 11, lines 56-61, cited by the Examiner appear to disclose the feature of claim 12 “the second activity flag value being mutually exclusive of the first activity flag value.” Thus, Applicant submits that claim 12 is in condition for allowance. Regarding claims 13-15, as noted above, Applicant submits that Oki fails to disclose the features of claim 11 from which claims 13-15 depend. Moreover, Applicant notes that Oki fails to disclose a “first activity flag value” consonant with the claimed invention. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 13-15 are also in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, Applicant has overcome all of the Office's rejections, and early notice of allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

09/16/2004

Date



Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Ross D. Snyder & Associates, Inc.

115 Wild Basin Road, Suite 107

Austin, Texas 78746

(512) 347-9223 (phone)

(512) 347-9224 (fax)